

The significance of Thomas's 'Tristan'

Article

Published Version

Hunt, T. (1981) The significance of Thomas's 'Tristan'. Reading Medieval Studies, VII. pp. 41-61. ISSN 0950-3129 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/84791/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Publisher: University of Reading

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

The Significance of Thomas's *Tristan*

The received wisdom concerning Thomas's *Tristan* is that he admires and commends courtly love.¹ An impartial critic might conclude from the surviving fragments that there is precious little love in this uncourtly tale, but this is not the common experience. The courtly love thesis has been facilitated by two general considerations. The first, which has no doubt been exaggerated, is the argument that in Thomas's poem *Tristan* and *Isolt* are attracted to each other before the potion is produced and that the love-drink is consequently exploited by Thomas simply as a poetic symbol of the quality of their love,² thus evacuating the awkward element of fatality. The second consideration is that Thomas concludes his work with a *commendatio operis* addressed to lovers. Actually, it is addressed 'a tuz amanz', but if the poem deals with courtly love, then he must mean courtly lovers! The temptation indeed is so great, despite the evident illogicality of the reasoning, that J.-C. Payen, in his recent edition and translation of the *Tristan* poems, contradicts himself by recognising that 'Thomas s'adresse, non sans provocation, à tous les amants même s'ils aiment mal', which covers l.821 (Sn²), and yet translating as *amanz* of l.833 (Sn²) by 'au plaisir des courtois'.³ Neither of the above arguments is cogent. However *Tristan* and *Isolt* were first attracted to each other, the potion is not dispensed with and *Tristan's* insistence, in the very same passage in which he refers to their early love, that 'El beivre fud la nostre mort, / Nus n'en avrum ja mais confort; / A tel ure dune nus fu / A nostre mort l'avum beū' (D1223-6) surely gives the lie to the idea that the experiences which form the subject of the tragic story had any other cause outside the potion (cf. Sn² 805 and D309-10).⁴ As for the epilogue, suffice it to say for the moment that it refers neither to courtly lovers nor courtly love.

It may now be wondered from where the courtly love thesis draws the bulk of its evidence. The answer is, of course, from the thousands of lines of Thomas which do not exist. This undeniably presents us with a methodological problem, which must not be evaded. Some idea of the importance of the issue can be gained from the fact that in his study of realism in twelfth-century literature, Anthime Fourrier devotes 43 pages to an analysis of those portions of Thomas which have perished⁵ and that Jonin, who will emerge as my closest ally, is criticised by Frappier and Wind for basing his study on nothing more than the surviving fragments.⁶ Clearly, the validity of reconstruction is at stake. Until someone produces a much needed critical commentary on Bédier's reconstructions of the *Tristan* legend, one must be content to observe the judicious conclusions of Professor Várvaro, who has argued that the possibilities for contamination make the reconstruction of a *Tristan* 'archetype' inadmissible - no *estoire* then - but that the evidence of the versions based on Thomas (*Gottfried*, the *Norse Saga*, *Sir Tristram* and, to a small

degree, the *Tavola Ritonda*) is not so vitiated and hence Bédier's reconstruction of Thomas may be accepted dans ses grandes lignes.⁷ Unfortunately, the benefits are more apparent than real, for, despite Frappier's emphasis on the value of the total literary structure, it remains a skeleton without flesh, which can tell us little about Thomas's attitude to what is, after all, an inherited tale. It is singularly unfortunate, then, that the surviving fragments overlap so little with the texts of the dependent versions, but a brief comparison will yield some evidence. The fragments of Thomas deal essentially with three things: the marriage of Tristan to Isolt of the White Hands (G.18953-19552; S.c.69; E.2641-2706);⁸ Tristan's episodic returns to Mark's court for the purpose of seeing Isolt, and including the *Salle aux Images* (G. -; S.c.89; E.2828-49); and his mortal wound and death (G. -; S.c.89-101; E. -). To read the other versions is to gain nothing of the detail or flavour of Thomas's treatment. It is true that in the marriage episode Gottfried displays a psychological interest in paradoxes which recalls Thomas, but he has nothing of the latter's moralistic interests.⁹ The *Tristramssaga* takes over only one of Thomas's characteristic *excursus*, that on envy (Sn¹ 755-70; S.c.71, p.86, ll.15-21). Otherwise the abbreviated accounts of the 'translatas' tell us nothing. Instead, what the comparison throws into relief is Thomas's uniquely characteristic technique of providing each section of narrative with a commentary or gloss of similar length and it is precisely this scholastic trait - unaccountably underestimated in published studies - which is cut by his adaptors and which is perforce missing from Bédier's reconstruction. This suggests the inference that the surviving fragments of Thomas may legitimately be used to characterise his approach to the legend and that the evidence of his successors may not. Before leaving this methodological submission, I should perhaps illustrate my contention concerning Thomas's gloss technique. Tristan's pre-nuptial monologue and its narrative introduction occupy 182 lines (Sn¹ 1-182): they are followed by a tripartite commentary (Sn¹ 183-368) extending to 186 lines (50 + 72 + 64). The extreme brevity of the narrative accounts of the marriage (Sn¹ 369-84 = 16), the wedding night (Sn¹ 385-94 = 10) and the nocturnal recreation of the partners (Sn¹ 589-648 = 60) contrasts with a 194-line commentary presented in the form of an interior monologue by Tristan (Sn¹ 395-588). The story of Tristan's wound which comprises two stories (Sn¹ 649-754) is followed by a digression of 26 lines on envy (Sn¹ 755-80). Turning to the Turin fragment, we have a systematic analysis of the amatory sufferings of *Tristan jalus* (51-70), then of Mark, the queen, Tristan and the second Isolt (71-151), followed by a new analysis of all four (152-83), the whole representing a commentary of 133 lines. In the Douce fragment there is a similar *divisio* relating to the queen, Tristan, Mark and Cariado, this time of 20 lines, and the climactic moment of Tristan's betrayal by the second Isolt is made the occasion of a 13-line *excursus* on envy (1323-35) inspired by *Eccles.* 25, 23.¹⁰

These commentaries thus seem to provide the right avenue for the exploration of Thomas's personal interests, despite the fact that they offer little encouragement to proponents of the courtly love thesis. The latter have, however, run up against another problem which has only recently been clearly articulated,¹¹ namely, the apparent paradox that a celebration of courtly love should end on a note of such extraordinary bleakness, the gouffre amère, one might almost say, of le néant. How is Thomas's audience to derive 'grant confort' from this tale of sadness and destruction? It would be easy to accept that the poignancy from which listeners might derive pleasure could fittingly be aroused by the tragic peripeteia of the tempest and the second Isolt's lie. Indeed, that Thomas does see this as the comble de misère and extracts from it a coup de théâtre which will move his audience, emerges from his intervention shortly before relating Isolt's voyage:

Oiez pituse disturbance,
Aventure mult doleruse
E a trestuz amanz pituse;
De tel desir, de tel amur
N'oïstes unc greniur dolor. (D.1582-86)

But the epilogue cannot rely alone on this single episode at the very end of a lengthy romance. Moreover, in the context of the surviving fragments the episode is not entirely characteristic, for the storm is the product of external forces, whereas the hallmark of Thomas's treatment of the legend must be seen in the fact that the change, tort, paine, dolor and engins d'amur mentioned in the epilogue are all the result, not of external forces, but of internal human conflicts and weaknesses. It is clear that we have not only to reconcile the confort of the epilogue with the peripeteia of the story, but also to relate it more broadly to the whole presentation of the lovers and their experience in the rest of what has come down to us. Once we embark on this larger course it is difficult to see how we can entertain the arguments put forward by Professor Le Gentil in his recent study of the epilogue.¹² We are able to agree, I think, that the lovers display no religious reflections at the approach of death and that Thomas offers no suggestions of any transcendental or redemptive significance in their death. Le Gentil is thus driven to acknowledge 'A coup sûr, une aussi peu religieuse et chrétienne conclusion, sous la plume d'un écrivain du XII^e siècle, a de quoi surprendre et déconcerter',¹³ and he even feels that the same effect would be experienced by a twelfth-century audience, understandably unhappy with the suggestion that the ideology of fin'amor 'même dans le meilleur des cas, conduisit à un désastre, si poétique qu'il fût'.¹⁴ But it is illogical to argue from the lovers' own lack of a religious perspective that Thomas's values are to be situated en marge du christianisme, for that would imply a degree of identification between author and characters which does not necessarily exist. Moreover, it is simply inaccurate to evince from the final aventure mult doleruse the impression that Thomas 'a glorifié la mort des amants'.

Had he done so, the problem of the epilogue – how it can represent the poem as a *consolatio* – would no longer be with us. No less inaccurate is the view that Thomas's lovers are so 'irréprochables et sympathiques' that he could not bring himself to criticise, still less condemn, them. Thomas's own commentaries, especially that on *novelerie*, are a sufficient refutation of this view. For *Le Gentil*, Thomas charted a cautious course between the Scylla of paganism and the Charybdis of modernity: if he did not protest at the human condition, his silence is nonetheless potentially subversive; passion has its own laws which will be obeyed.¹⁵ It is obvious that to place Thomas's world *en marge du christianisme* is to close one's eyes to the result of Jonin's researches. This we should be unwilling to do.

At this point we might infiltrate a suggestion which is relevant to all that follows in the rest of the discussion. As is well known, Heinrich von Freiberg, who worked at the court of Wenzel II (†.1305), was commissioned by Raimund von Lichtenburg sometime in the period 1280–90 to write the continuation of *Gottfried* based on Thomas, albeit through some intermediary.¹⁶ He concluded it as follows:

Nu dar, ir werlde minner,
sehet alle in disen spiegel her
und schouwet, wie in aller vrîst
hin slîchende unde genclîch ist
die wertlîche minne !
Îsôt die kûniginne,
swie die in sîner minne bran
und in ir minne her Tristan,
ez nam doch swachez ende.
Ein ieglîch cristen wende
herze, muot und sinne
hin zu der wâren minne,
die unzurgenclîch immer ist.
Wir cristen sulen minnen Crist,
der von der megde wart geborn
und uns den blûenden rôsendorn
bezeichnet wol in aller stunt;
der an dem criuze durch uns wunt
wart in den tôt pînîche gnuoc;
und der die rôten rôsen truoc
mit bitterlîchem smerzen
durch uns an sînem herzen,
an vûezen und an henden.
Wir cristen sulen wenden
an in lîp, sêle und unser leben;

wan wir ez sîn die wînreben,
 die ûz im liez ensprîezen er
 und uns der trûben vruchtbêr
 hât gemacht, daz wir hân
 sîn und vornunft. nu ruofe wir an
 den vater des himelischen suns,
 daz er lâ vlechten sich in uns
 den wâren blûenden rôsendorn,
 Crist sînen zarten sun einborn
 und uns die genâde gebe,
 daz wir alsam die wînrebe
 uns vlechten wider in in
 und unser herze und unseren sîn
 in im vorwerren und vorweben,
 als man sach den wînreben
 sich vlechten in den rôsendorn
 Über den gelieben ûz erkorn,
 die in der liebe ir ende nâmen.
 nu sprechet: âmen, âmen, âmen !

(II.6847-890)

(Therefore, worldly lovers, look into this mirror and observe how easily, at all times, worldly love passes away and perishes. . . It turned out ill for Queen Isolt, even though she burned with love of Tristan and he with love of her. Let every Christian soul turn his heart, mind and spirit to that true love which never perishes. We who are Christians should love Christ, who was born of the Virgin and who is symbolised for us evermore in the blossoming rose, who on the cross was sorely wounded, even unto death, for our sake, who for our sake in bitter pain bore the red roses in His heart, His feet, His hands. To Him we who are Christians should direct our selves, our soul and our life. It is we who are the vines which He sent forth, which He made fruitful, that we might possess sense and understanding. Let us call upon the Father of the Heavenly Son to entwine within us the true, blossoming rose, Christ his dear and only begotten Son, and to give us grace that we may entwine with Him, mingling and interweaving with Him our heart and mind, just as the vine and the rose entwined over the grave of the two handsome lovers, whose end lay in their love. Say now, Amen.)

The point of this quotation is not to establish a comparison with the epilogue of Thomas's poem, but to demonstrate that the story of Tristan and Isolt, and more particularly, in the approximate form in which Thomas reworks it, might be seen as a negative exemplum. Thomas is a learned, intellectual writer

who had evidently passed through the schools and acquired a searching knowledge of dialectic. In connection with his equally developed interest in moral issues, however, it should not be forgotten that the contemptus mundi theme was an integral part of the study of the trivium, figuring prominently in such works as Adelard of Bath's De eodem et diverso, Conrad of Hirsau's Dialogus super auctores, Matthew of Vendôme's Tobias and an almost ubiquitous text known as Chartula.¹⁷ Can the Tristan of Thomas be read in the spirit of this tradition?

Let us first of all turn back to the epilogue and consider the phrase engins d'amur (839), which, incidentally, is not far removed from the laqueus fallax animarum with which the Chartula describes the beauty of women. Now this word engin dominates the semantic arena within which the conflicts of the poem take place. It occurs 18 times in the fragments, compared with only 3 occurrences in a contemporary work where artifice and deception are equally prominent, the Cligès of Chrestien de Troyes.¹⁸ In all the instances bar one it has a strongly negative sense which contrasts with the more positive nuances found in twelfth-century texts which have recently been studied by Robert Hanning.¹⁹ The verb enginnier is used no fewer than 11 times and is complemented by numerous verbs of deception such as deceivre (12 times), mentir (11 times), trichier (7 times). This bespeaks a certain pessimism. But the sombreness which pervades the presentation of the Tristan story is assured by more than this. One cannot overlook the frequency of other words with negative connotations, notably ire and haïr. Indeed, it is these two which are the principal determinants of the everpresent dolor which sets the tone of almost every section of the work and which, with duel, -occurs some 74 times.²⁰ Ire and its derivatives (particularly ire and irur) occur 26 times, usually in contrast to amur, and, with only three exceptions (Sn¹ 720, D78, D367), denote anger or resentment.²¹ Haïr and its derivatives (e.g. haïr) occur some 50 times, a surprising frequency for a love story. The 'fatality' with which Thomas's poem deals is the natural, not the supernatural; it is an interiorised drama in which the moral flaws of the characters (none of them remains untarnished), rather than Aristotelian hamartiai, bring about the final catastrophe: les dieux sont absents. The vocabulary of the surviving fragments is uniformly gloomy and the point need not be further insisted on: ahan, anguisse, dehait, dolor, duel, detresce, ennui, eschil, grevance, langur, mesaise, paine, pesance, tristur, turment.²²

There is one word, however, which certainly requires further investigation, since it was made by Frappier into a mot-clé for the courtly interpretation of the poem. This is the word raison.²³ Frappier's study of this concept is curiously tendentious, for the evidence is constantly forced into a pre-conceived semantic mould which leads him to assert "'Raison" devient ainsi dans le Tristan de Thomas la conscience de la fine amor comprise comme une éthique et, plus encore, comme une religion' (p.171). There are five crucial examples in a

total of 14:

1. Sn¹ 193: Pur ço volt femme espuser
Qu'Isolt n'en puisse blamer
Que encontre raison delit quierge,
Que sa proeise nen afirge.

On the strength of encuntre amur in l.188, Frappier describes raison as 'à peu près synonyme d'amur' (p.172). There is an ambiguity involving this line (195) which really renders any argument insecure, especially as Wind and Bédier diverge in their interpretations. In Bédier's interpretation, taking Isolt as the subject, line 195 would mean that Tristan wishes to marry Isolt of the White Hands so that the queen cannot accuse him of taking his pleasure illegitimately, in a way that is discordant with his nobility. The defence is not merely that marriage is involved but also that Tristan marries the second Isolt on account of her name and her beauty which are reminiscent of the queen. If Isolt is the object in line 194, it is less easy to see what raison would mean and how the main clause (l.193) is logically linked with what follows (i.e. both 194-6 and 197-8). No definitive solution is possible here,²⁴ though it is clear that an entirely acceptable sense is given by the view that Tristan, by marrying a woman who so recalls the queen in name and beauty, ensures that his pursuit of pleasure is not encontre raison or destructive of his nobility. Of course, it is possible to give encontre raison an amatory sense here, but the reference to Tristan's proeise might support a more general moral sense.

2. Sn¹ 294: [Homes e femmes] trop par changent lor talent
E lor desir e lor voleir
Cuntre raison, cuntre poeir.

Frappier sees that raison might indicate 'L'élément modérateur de la pensée, la rectitude d'esprit, l'équilibre du jugement', which is exactly what I think it does mean here, but he simply prefers to suggest that 'le mot exprime une loi fondamentale de la fine amor, imprudemment violée, pour leur châtement, par les inconstants' (p.172).

3. Sn¹ 433: Car tant ai vers Ysolt fait
Que n'est raison que ceste (= ls.11) m'ait.

No argument can refute the natural rendering 'it is not right' here, but Frappier insists 'Cette 'raison' est son amour d'Isolt, l'impératif catégorique de la fine amor' (p.172).

4. Sn¹ 595-6 (the scene of the wedding night)
 Sa nature proveir se volt,
 La raison se tient a Ysolt.

The most obvious sense is again 'reason' because, as I shall show, ratio and libido are similarly contrasted by moralists of the period. Thomas's commentaries deal with moral issues and never directly invoke fin'amor (with one exception which I shall discuss later). But Frappier will have none of this. Raison here 'se confond avec la fidélité à l'amour d'Iseut la Blonde, à la fine amor'. By now it will have become clear that Frappier's constant repetition of the phrase fine amor is merely rhetorical special pleading and that it is sufficient to see here nothing more than the moral norm of fidelity contrasted with instinct, as is clear in the next occurrence.

5. Sn¹ 601: Amur e raison le destraint
 E le voleir de sun cors vaint.

Love and the moral principle of fidelity lead Tristan to abstain from seeking pleasure with his new wife. But for Frappier the mere coordination of the two is enough to demonstrate 'leur synonymie aux yeux de Thomas' (p.173). He shows no hesitation in capitalising them and supplying the gloss 'cet hendiadyn traduit l'essence de l'amour courtois' (p.172). Whilst none would deny that fidelity is a necessary condition for amour courtois, it is certainly not a sufficient condition.

Against Frappier's view I would urge that raison indicates a dispassionate, moral faculty: faire saveir (Sn¹ 277).²⁵ Ratio had played an important part in Adelard's De eodem et diverso and in other texts of the contemptus mundi tradition. It is a key concept in the influential Moralium dogma philosophorum, sometimes attributed to William of Conches, and completed for the young Henry II Plantagenet.²⁶

Temperantia est dominium rationis in libidinem et alios
 motus inopportunos. (p.41, II.10-11).

Pudicia est moderamine rationis petulantiam domare. Nam si
 libido animum possidet, ea dominatur, animus nichil valet.
 Nemo enim umquam libidini simul et usui paruit. Voluptas
 enim fragilis est, brevis, fastidio obiecta, quo avidius acta
 est, citius in contrarium recedens, cuius subinde necesse est
 aut peniteat aut pudeat quemquam. (p.52, II.1-6)

Finally, we may recall that Heinrich von Freiberg invokes sin und vornunft in the epilogue of his Tristan in which they are clearly linked with the pursuit, not of earthly love, but of the love of Christ.

Although for the purposes of the present argument it is unnecessary to furnish an exact definition of *fin'amor*, something must be said about the relationship of the fragments to the ideology of this kind of love. At the outset it is essential not to confuse *courtoisie*, or courtly manners, with *amour courtois* and it is equally important not to confuse description with commendation. Even if Thomas discerned the dynamics of *fin'amor* in the love of Tristan and Isolt, this would not of itself imply that he approved of it, still less that he was a propagandist.²⁷

In fact, as Reiss and Burnley have shown,²⁸ the medieval use of the expression *fin'amor* is entirely compatible with Christian morality and it is in a much narrower sense that it is used by critics to denote a kind of love in which the lady is cast in the leading role of *dompna* and the man in the subordinate role of vassal. In this narrower view the value of the love relationship is seen in terms of aspiration and effort rather than in terms of possession. The man is convinced of the educative and edifying value of his subservience to the lady, however success may elude him. The courtliness of Thomas is fashioned by traditional Christian morality. It is Tristan himself who adumbrates the categorical imperative of *franchise*: 'Que encuntre mal ne deit mal rendre' (Sn¹ 140).²⁹ Thomas, in his critique of *novelerie*, regrets that humans in their instability 'tant usent la colvertise / Qu'il ne seient qu'est franchise, / E tant demainent vilanie, / Qu'il oblient cortoise' (Sn¹ 241-4). Like *franchise*, *courtoisie* is subsumed within conventional morality. In the same excursus Thomas clearly shows how *novelerie*, that is, *malveis desir*, *malveis voleir*, is opposed to *ratio*: 'Faire saveir, guprir folie, / Car ço n'est pas novelerie / Ki change pur sei amender / U pur sei de mal oster' (Sn¹ 277-80). There is no doubt at all that for Thomas Tristan's marriage to Isolt of the White Hands represents *novelerie* and is condemned - it is a libidinous, not a moral, impulse on which Tristan acts. Although he holds back from consummation of his desire, Tristan consequently finds himself in a moral impasse of even greater complexity than before, one that has been clearly predicted by Thomas,³⁰ since it involves repudiation of his marriage vows (Sn¹ 413ff, 425ff), leading to both dishonour and sin (Sn¹ 500-3). The importance of the conjugal relationship in Thomas leads us distinctly away from the ideology of *fin'amor* to which it is an irrelevance. On the only occasions on which the narrator uses the expression *fin'amor* it emerges clearly that he has no precise or technical conception of the term at all. It is repeated in a passage describing Tristan's motives in marrying the second Isolt. We are first told that Tristan could not have loved her with '*fin'amur*', for in that case he would not have married her against the wishes of the queen (Sn¹ 319-21). Soon after it is equally affirmed of Tristan's attitude to the queen 'Se de *fin'amur* l'amast, / L'autre Ysolt nen espusast' (Sn¹ 329-30). This usage sorts with the results of Burnley's investigations in which the importance of stability and purity of motive is well brought out.³¹

Later, in the Douce fragment, Tristan will ask Caherdin to remind the queen 'E des joies e des dusurs / De nostre amur fine e veraie' (D1219) and she herself will acknowledge 'Vers vus ai si fine amur' (D1679). In the narrower, technical sense *fin'amor* is entirely belied by the misgivings of the characters themselves. The queen's acknowledgement, which we have just cited, is made at precisely the same moment that she expresses fears that after her death Tristan may seek consolation with an other (D1680ff). This jealousy, concerning both Isolt of the White Hands and a possible future lover, ironically reflects Tristan's own jealousy of Mark, 'sis dreit espus, / Ki fait l'amur partir de nos' (Sn¹ 167f) which obsesses him to the point that he must himself experience the conjugal bond! In *fin'amor*, in the narrower sense, jealousy is unheard of³² and conjugal love an irrelevance. Moreover, Tristan's unsatisfied longing for Isolt the queen, far from being accepted as an educative experience, frustrates and paralyzes him. Whatever *fin'amor* may or may not be, there is no room in it for reflections like the following: 'Que valt tant lunges demurer / E sun bien tuit diz consirer?' (Sn¹ 39) or 'Que valt l'amur a maintenir / Dunt nul bien ne put avenir?' (Sn¹ 41-2). That tension of desire, which is the very stuff of the troubadours' love, is deliberately dissipated for the purpose of obtaining relief and in the hope of forgetting the queen.³³ It is surely clear that not only is this not courtly love, but it is not morally legitimate either, since it infringes the prohibition *mal pur mal rendre*. Nothing could be more uncourtly than Tristan's doubts about the queen³⁴ and his entirely selfish pursuit of satisfaction concerning which Thomas is unambiguous in his disapproval.³⁵ Tristan's *desir* has become *malvais voleir* (Sn¹ 253, 360). Such are the *engins d'amur*!

In the first Sneyd fragment, therefore, we see how amatory fidelity and conjugal obligation are given equal legitimacy; lover and wife are granted equal rights. This is not a courtly perspective. But, then, there is no reason to doubt Thomas's protestations of ignorance concerning women and the more intimate ways of the world (Sn¹ 287-91; T 144ff, 187-91; D 1334f).³⁶ He is a moralist who shows all his protagonists behaving dishonourably under the influence of passion, when they are not plunged in gloom.³⁷ So far as the lovers are concerned, it is not *fin'amor* but *thanatos* which dominates this poem.³⁸ It is therefore right, I think, to contend that Thomas's poem is a pessimistic account of the vicissitudes of purely human love in the perspective of traditional Christian morality and that the critical studies which discern in the work a celebration of *fin'amor* are so imprecise that almost any situation involving fidelity and longing can be assimilated to the notion of courtly love.

Now it is time to return to the problems posed by the epilogue. In 1967, Emmanuelle Baumgartner and Robert-Léon Wagner published an article on the epilogue³⁹ from which I extract three preliminary assertions: (i) Thomas's poem is intended to have an exemplary value, that is, it is didactic, (ii) the

dedication is a global one, to all lovers, (iii) the stylistic evidence suggests that the enumeration of the lovers follows the pattern of quasi-synonymic pairs.⁴⁰ With these arguments I readily concur. Now the senses which the authors give to the pairs of synonyms are perfectly defensible, but they are related to the content of the story in a way which I find difficult to accept. The pensis and amerus ('âmes sensibles', 'les sentimentaux', p.530) will take courage in the face of betrayals, injustices, grief, etc. Why should they do this? Apparently because Tristan's and Isol't sufferings are so much worse than their own!⁴¹ The emvius and the desirus ('Ceux qui aspirent tristement [my italics] au bonheur d'aimer) will see that patience, waiting, slow progress and frustration are the common lot of lovers. But in this poem even these experiences issue in destruction and death, so the consolatio is a little difficult to find. Finally, the enveisiez and purvers ('qui s'opiniâtrent dans l'avisement des plaisirs') will learn to recognise and avoid the snares of carnal love by meditating on the sad case of Isol't of the White Hands. But how does she serve as a warning against carnal love? I propose that the whole poem is intended as a negative exemplum and that the diz e vers of D830 refer to the sententiae scattered throughout the work which enhance the tale by bringing out its qualities as an exemplum. Thomas, most strikingly, does not once refer to courtly lovers and I take his three synonymic pairs as categorising, between them, all lovers, namely, (a) those who are love-sick (i.e. already afflicted by love), (b) those who seek love, and (c) the lascivious (does purvers indicate homosexuals under the influence of the De planctu naturae?). At no point does Thomas refer to positive or joyous qualities in either lovers or dramatis personae. But this is surely because confort is to be taken in its etymological sense of strengthening and together with the preposition encontre indicates that lovers will find their resistance strengthened to the engins d'amur, which include change, tort, paine and dolor.⁴² This explains an interesting feature of the ending. In her final monologue (Sn² 783ff) Isol't uses many of the words of the epilogue (confort, emveisure, paine, dolor, recordé), but precisely because she is reflecting on how she might have consoled Tristan ('Vie vos oïse, amis, rendue, / E parlé dulcement a vos / De l'amur qu'ad esté entre nas'; Sn² 791-3) she thinks of 'nostre joie, nostre emveisure' (Sn² 795), just as Tristan had asked her to do (D1214ff). It is quite striking that Thomas has excluded this element of joy from his epilogue because he sees in the fate of the lovers a deterrent rather than consolatory or comforting power. In the light of Heinrich von Freiberg's epilogue we may well find ironic Frappier's bold assertion 'Thomas ambitionna, périlleusement, de composer un évangile de la fine amor, sans oublier le Golgotha ... Il est permis de reconnaître un écho de la parole du Christ: "Venez à moi, vous qui souffrez", quand à la fin de son poème il adresse un appel à tous les amants de tous les temps'.⁴³ In my view the epilogue asserts that all manner of lovers will derive pleasure from the exemplary qualities of the tale (which Thomas, in his commentaries, has consistently sought to clarify) and strength against the engins d'amur.

Perhaps the most difficult expression is *se recorder* (*not se mirer* which is much more common). In this connection it should not be forgotten that the widespread recruitment of adults by the new religious orders of the twelfth century meant that many who had had long experience of worldly pursuits came to turn away from secular pleasures and to adopt some form of religious life⁴⁴ and this may have created an atmosphere in which secular stories might be used for didactic purposes. Some of Thomas's audience might thus find in the tale reflections of earlier stages of their amatory experience and thereby renew their resistance to the snares of love. Be that as it may, it is interesting to note that Thomas does not seem to have wished to associate his tale with the prestige of an Arthurian setting. The role of Arthur is minimised,⁴⁵ leaving Thomas free to paint his somewhat unedifying picture of Mark's court and its conflicts.

If this view of Thomas as a pessimistic commentator on the vicissitudes of earthly love⁴⁶ is correct, it is obviously important to consider the *milieu* in which he may have been writing.⁴⁷ The right *milieu*, I think, is suggested by Egbert Türk's recent study of the *curiales* surrounding Henry II of England.⁴⁸ In the writings of Arnulf of Lisieux, John of Salisbury, Gerald of Wales, Peter of Blois and Walter Map, Türk discovers 'une sorte d'allergie chez certains ecclésiastiques à l'entourage du premier Plantagenêt' (p.XII) and examines the widening gap between orthodox Christian morality and the political policies and ethics of the king and the *curiales* with their secular interests. The disloyalty, deception and instability of the court, as described, for example, by Walter Map at the beginning and end of the *De nugis curialium*, seem to find an echo in Thomas's *excursus* on *novelerie*.⁴⁹ But above all, of course, Thomas is dealing with an *extra-conjugal* love relationship. It is difficult to see how the tone and outcome of this relationship in all its sombre tragedy could please Eleanor, who in any case is coming to be regarded as a politician more than a patroness of literature.⁵⁰ Fourrier, basing his arguments on both Bédier's reconstruction and links (somewhat dubious it must be admitted) with the contemporary Irish background, suggested that Thomas started his *Tristan* in 1172 at Henry's court.⁵¹ This is a very interesting suggestion, whatever the reasons which impelled Fourrier to propose it. In January 1169, Henry divided up his continental territories among his sons and in June 1170 Eleanor supported the coronation of the young Henry at York. He was crowned a second time in 1172 and the following year took refuge with Louis VII. Thus began the war against Henry II, and by 1174 Eleanor was imprisoned. This period (1168-73) has hence rightly been described as 'a rather somber one, overcast by strains of jealousy, rancor and intrigue'.⁵² Whilst little is known about Eleanor's activities and influence before this period, it is clear that the estrangement and betrayal of 1173 mark a turning point. It is precisely at the time of Eleanor's imprisonment that Henry publicly acknowledged his adultery with the egregious Fair Rosamund, the *rosa mundi* whom Gerald of Wales

splenetically converted to *rosa immundi*. She was one of the six children of Walter de Clifford (d.1190?), a knight of the Welsh border, and may have become Henry's mistress shortly after the birth to Henry and Eleanor of their last child, the future King John, in 1166. At any rate, Rosamund was Henry's mistress by 1173 and remained so until her death⁵³ which is thought to have taken place three years later, whereafter she became the subject of innumerable stories and legends.⁵⁴ The imprisoned queen cannot, of course, have really had any hand in Rosamund's death, whatever the legends may say,⁵⁵ but the events of the rebellion show her to have quite suddenly turned against her husband. Gervase of Canterbury describes Eleanor as '*prudens femina valde, nobilibus orta natalibus, sed instabilis*',⁵⁶ and a recent commentator declares 'Her passionate pride and jealous dedication to upholding her rights and status led her to undertake and execute vendettas aimed simply at avenging indignities she had suffered'.⁵⁷ Of course, Thomas's *Tristan* is not a *roman à clef*, but do we not have the circumstances here which might have occasioned a particularly gloomy treatment of a famous love-theme and provided the atmosphere in which an audience would have appreciated the point of such a treatment? We should at least consider the possibility that Thomas's recourse to the *Tristan* legend could be seen as a response to a situation in which (1) Henry had both a mistress and a wife, (2) his wife became jealous and, further, betrayed him, and (3) the mistress died (according to legend at the hands of his wife). The criticisms of the court studied by Türk and the amatory predicament of the king and the ensuing scandal might thus furnish the circumstances in which a moralistic writer like Thomas might employ a familiar tale to warn his audience against the snares of sexual love. It is therefore likely that Thomas was writing at the court of Henry II in the 1170s. As for *fin'amor*, Thomas was probably as little interested in it at this time as Eleanor was,⁵⁸ however relevant we may judge Henry's conduct to be.

TONY HUNT,
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS.

NOTES

1. The staunchest proponents of this view are M. Lazar, Amour courtois et 'fin'amors' dans la littérature du XIIe siècle, Paris 1964, pp.160-70 and J. Frappier, 'Structure et sens du Tristan: version commune, version courtoise', CCM 6 (1963), esp. 263 and 265, cf. id. in Romania 93 (1972), 189 n.1.
2. See J. Marx, 'La naissance de l'amour de Tristan et Iseut dans les formes les plus anciennes de la légende', R.Ph. 9 (1955-56), 167-73 and D. Beyerle, 'Der Lieberstrank im Thomas Tristan', Rom. Jbch. 14 (1963), 78-86. See the Douce fragment, ll.1214ff. I follow the text, line numbering and sigla of B.H. Wind (ed.), Thomas, Les Fragments du Roman de Tristan, Genève/Paris 1960.
3. J.C. Payen (ed. and transl.), Tristan et Iseut, Paris 1974, p.350, n.78 and p.244.
4. This 'pre-filtral' love, which is the pillar of the version commune - courtoise structure, is rightly minimised by R.J. Cormier, 'Bédier, Brother Robert and the Roman de Tristan', Etudes de philologie romane offertes à Jules Horrent, Liège 1980, pp.69-75, who shows the weakness of the evidence. Cf. P. Jonin, Les personnages féminins dans les romans français de Tristan au XIIe siècle, Aix-en-Provence 1958, pp.291f and Frappier in CCM 6 (1963), 273ff.
5. A. Fourrier, Le courant réaliste dans le roman courtois en France au moyen âge, t.1, Paris 1960, pp.19-109, 46-89.
6. See Frappier in CCM 6 (1963), 263 and Wind in R.Ph. 14 (1960-61), 12.
7. A. Várvaro, 'La teoria dell'archetipo tristaniano', Romania 88 (1967), 13-58.
8. I employ the following sigla: G = Gottfried von Strassburg (ed. F. Ranke, Berlin 1930); S = Tristrans Saga (ed. E. Kölbing, Heilbronn 1878); E = Sir Tristram (ed. E. Kölbing, Heilbronn 1882).
9. Cf. A. Bossert, Tristan et Iseut. Poème de Gotfrit de Strasbourg comparé à d'autres poèmes sur le même sujet, Paris 1865, pp.109-13.
10. There is a brief analysis of the excursus in L. Peiffer, Zur Funktion der Exkurse im 'Tristan' Gottfrieds von Strassburg, Göttingen 1971,

pp.80-94. Whilst grasping their moralistic and antithetical character, Dr. Peiffer seems to me to underestimate their relevance to the characters and action to which they are juxtaposed.

11. See P. Le Gentil, 'Sur l'épilogue du Tristan de Thomas', Mélanges Jeanne Lods, Paris 1978, pp.365-70.
12. supra.
13. Ibid., p.367.
14. Ibid., p.369.
15. I discount the final lurch in Le Gentil's balancing act which pushes us towards 'quelque secrète et utopique espérance plutôt qu'un orgueilleux défi ou un très pessimiste constat d'échec', art. cit., 370.
16. See II.6842ff in the edition of R. Bechstein (Leipzig 1877): 'als Thômas von Britanîa sprach / von den zwein süezen jungen / in lampartischer zungen, / alsô hân ich iu die wârheit / in diutsche von in zwein geseit'.
17. See R. Bultot, 'La Chartula et l'enseignement du mépris du monde dans les écoles et les universités médiévales', Studi Medievali III, 8 (1967), 787-834. Consider the following lines (PL 184, 1309B): Causa gravis scelorum cessabit amor mulierum; / Colloquium quarum nil est nisi virus amarum, / Praebens sub mellis dulcedine pocula fellis. / Nam decor illarum laqueus fallax animarum. / Cum verbis blandis, fallacibus atque nefandis / Illaqueat stultos et fert ad tartara multos. / Tempora transibunt et gaudia vana peribunt, / Et parient fructum tristem per saecula luctum'.
18. See H.P. Schwake, Der Wortschatz des Cliges von Chrétien de Troyes, Beihefte zur Z. f. rom. Phil. Bd 149 (Tübingen 1979).
19. R.W. Hanning, The Individual in Twelfth-Century Romance (New Haven, etc., 1977), ch.3 ('Engin in Twelfth-Century Courtly Texts'), pp.105-38. For a more general introduction to the word, see J.D. Schleyer, Der Wortschatz von List und Betrug im altfranzösischen und altprovenzalischen, Romanistische Versuche und Vorarbeiten 10, diss. Bonn, 1961, pp.10-24 & 41-44.
20. See Phyllis Johnson, 'Dolor, dolent et soidoloir: le vocabulaire de la douleur et la conception de l'amour selon Béroul et Thomas', R.Ph. 26 (1972-73), 546-54.

21. See G. Kleiber, Le mot 'ire' en ancien français (XIe-XIIIe siècles) Essai d'analyse sémantique, Paris 1978, pp.249-347.
22. See Johnson, art. cit., 553-4 for statistics concerning word frequency.
23. See J. Frappier, 'Sur le mot 'raison' dans le Tristan de Thomas d'Angleterre', Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Helmut A. Hatzfeld, ed. A.S. Crisafulli, Washington D.C. 1964, pp. 163-76. The insecurity of his thesis is manifest on p.175 where Frappier comes close to accepting Jonin's view and insists again on the 'context', which is taken, a priori, to be that of courtly love. Frappier is supported by O. Jodogne, 'Comment Thomas d'Angleterre a compris l'amour de Tristan et d'Iseut', Lettres Romanes 19 (1965), 103-119, esp. 112, but this is based on acceptance that it is sufficient to identify amour courtois with little more than 'la fidélité à la dame'. Jonin's demonstration of a debt to St Bernard's use of ratio is accepted by Wind, Neophilologus 45 (1961), 284.
24. Payen, op. cit., p.153 and n.6 adopts Wind's interpretation, with Isolt as object, as does Del Monte, Tristano. Introduzione, testi, traduzioni, Napoli 1952, p.55. Hatto, in the translation appended to his version of Gottfried, supposes Bédier's interpretation, with Isolt as subject, see A.T. Hatto, Gottfried von Strassburg. Tristan. With the 'Tristan' of Thomas, Harmondsworth 1960, p.303. None of the translators renders raison with anything like amour.
25. I thus agree with Jonin, op. cit., pp.417ff. On the background see A. Yon, Ratio et les mots de la famille de reor, Paris 1933; G.-Ed. Demers, 'Les divers sens du mot ratio au moyen âge. Autour d'un texte de Maître Ferrier de Catalogne (1275)', Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du XIIIe siècle, Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales d'Ottawa, Paris/Ottawa 1932, pp.105-9; Hans Flasche, Die begriffliche Entwicklung des Wortes 'ratio' und seiner Ableitungen im Französischen bis 1500, Leipziger romanistische Studien I, 10 (1936); F. Bechthold, 'Über den französischen Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes', Romanische Forschungen 49 (1935), 21-180; P. Badel, 'Raison "Fille de Dieu" et le rationalisme de Jean de Meun', Mélanges Frappier I, Genève 1970, pp. 41-52.
26. See D. Rocher, 'Tradition latine et morale chevaleresque', Etudes germaniques 19 (1964), esp. 130ff; on authorship see J.R. Williams, 'The Quest for the Author of the Moralium Dogma Philosophorum 1931-1956', Speculum 32 (1957), 736-47. I quote from the edition of J. Holmberg (Uppsala, etc., 1929).

27. It is difficult to know exactly where the emphasis falls in this comment by Le Gentil, BBSIA 18 (1966), 178: 'il est frappant de voir comment, dans les fragments relatifs au mariage de Tristan et à la querelle de Brengain et Iseut, ledit Thomas fournit des explications, développe des interprétations, attribue à ses personnages des attitudes qui ne concordent pas avec la courtoisie, appelée pourtant en fin de compte à triompher'. Le Gentil concludes in favour of a fruitful ambiguity, an 'insécurité latente' in Thomas!

28. See E. Reiss, 'Chaucer's *fyn lovyng* and the Late Medieval Sense of *fin'amor*', *Medieval Studies in Honor of Lillian Herlands Homstein*, ed. J.B. Bessinger Jr. and R.R. Raymo, New York 1976, pp.181-91; id., 'Fin'Amors: Its History and Meaning in Medieval Literature', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 8 (1979), 74-99; J.D. Burnley, 'Fine Amor: Its Meaning and Context', *RES* N.S. 31 (1980), 129-48.

29. See I *Peter*, III, 9.

30. See Sn¹ 335ff.

31. *Art. cit.*, esp. 138f and the discussion of Thomas in 143f.

32. See E. Köhler, 'Les troubadours et la jalousie', *Mélanges Frappier*, t.1, Genève 1970, pp.543-59, who writes 'L'amour courtois ne tolère pas la jalousie' (p.543) and speaks of 'l'incompatibilité de ces deux termes' (p.549). See also F. Barteau, *Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut. Introduction à une lecture plurielle*, Paris 1972, pp.174ff, who argues that jealousy and lack of confidence by Tristan in Isolt are uncourtly traits ('faute énorme, bien sûr, contre la "courtoisie"') and that Tristan is finally punished for not being sufficiently 'subversive' in his devotion to the queen.

33. I am in complete agreement here with Eva Rozgonyi, 'Pour une approche d'un Tristan non-courtois', *Mélanges Crozet*, t.2, Poitiers 1966, pp.821-28. On Tristan's marriage to the second Isolt, see Jonin, *op. cit.*, 305ff and see 308f for Tristan's emphasis on the physical components of love (Sn¹ 518f, 521, 537ff).

34. They are repeated at the beginning of the Turin fragment, II.6ff, together with his jealousy of Cariado. Thomas's approach to jealousy is entirely that of the moralist, not of the apologist of *fin'amor* (see T 55ff), who emphasises the *estranged amor* of all the protagonists, who know only sadness and not joy. One is reminded of Cant. VIII, 6: *fortis est ut mors dilectio, dura sicut infernus aemulatio*.

35. See Tristan's own strictures in Sn¹ 417ff. Note also his emphasis on the copula carnalis (Sn¹ 517ff) and the importance of physical love, 'car ço est que plus alie / En amor amant e amie' (Sn¹ 539-40). The use of recreantise to denote abstinence (Sn¹ 518, 534) seems like an inversion of the well known locus in Erec.
36. I see in these protestations a deliberate aloofness from the world of sadness and despair, a pessimistic resignation in the face of human perversity. At the queen's outburst in D 86ff, Thomas may well have thought of Prov. 25, 24: Melius est sedere in angulo domatis, quam cum muliere litigiosa, et in domo communis !
37. For their misery see T 71ff, D 477ff, D 589ff and for their dishonour Sn¹ 500ff, D 40, D 265f, D 288, D 298.
38. See R. Curtis, 'Love and Death in Thomas's Tristan', in eadem, Tristan Studies, München 1969, pp.36-41. J.M. Ferrante, The Conflict of Love and Honor. The Medieval Tristan Legend in France, Germany and Italy, The Hague/Paris 1973, p.80, writes 'The dominant characteristics of Thomas's hero are his predisposition to tragedy and suffering which he inherits from his parents and the desire for death which comes to the fore several times in the story; when he is suffering from Morolt's wound, when Ysolt rejects him, and finally when he thinks she has failed him, on his death-bed'. Barteau, op.cit., p.254 claims 'On constatera que dans tout ce roman, il y a une obsession de la mort, redoutée certes, mais appelée'. Fourrier, op. cit., p.107 makes of amour courtois such an elastic term that he can define it as 'un art de souffrir et d'en mourir'. An element of masochism in the story is freely admitted by Frappier in CCM 6 (1963), 263 and by Payen, ed. cit., p.XIII. Cf. D 605, D 613-4, D 1647-8 (mort and murir occur 17 times in the queen's monologue), D 1764.
39. '"As enveisiez e as purvers". Commentaire sur les vers 3125-3129 du Roman de Tristan de Thomas', Romania 88 (1964), pp.136-47.
40. On this device see, for example, S. Pellegrini, 'Iterazioni sinonimiche nella Canzone di Rolando', in id., Studi Rolandiani e trobadorici, Bari 1964, pp.136-47.
41. Cf. Payen, ed. cit., p.XII, 'Le Tristan de Thomas est consolant (permet d'avoir confort) parce que les malheurs ordinaires des amants n'ont aucune commune mesure avec cette tragédie ...'

42. Payen, *ed. cit.*, p.244 translates Sn² 836 by 'un enseignement salutaire contre', but this is difficult to reconcile with his rendering of the preceding line as 'le miroir exemplaire de ce qu'ils vivent'. In the *Mélanges Le Gentil* (Paris 1973), p.622, he says that the audience may 'par le prestige de l'art connaître un instant d'évasion'. I have examined the 21 cases of confort in the poem and there seems little doubt that it is used with two distinct senses: (1) support, help or encouragement and (2) consolation, happiness, in more or less equal proportions (1. = C 46, D 105, D 123, D 999, D 1128 (cf *aïe* D 1131 and 1133), D 1202, D 1210, D 1224 (=remedy), D 1265, D 1443, D 1543, D 1633, D 1792. 2. = D 951, D 1004, D 1174, D 1622, D 1669, D 1683, D 1767, Sn² 785). The one other case of confort (en)cuntre (D 1633) clearly supports the sense of help (*aïe*), support: 'Car altre dolor n'ai jo mie / Fors de ço que n'avez aïe. / Ço est ma dolor e ma grevance, / E al cuer en ai grant pesance / Que vus n'avrez, amis, confort, / Quant jo muer, contre vostre mort' (D 1629-34).
43. *CCM* 6 (1963), 454.
44. See J. Leclercq, *Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France*, Oxford 1978 and J.H. Lynch, 'Monastic Recruitment in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Some Social and Economic Considerations', *American Benedictine Review* 26 (1975), 425-47.
45. See U. Møllk, 'Die Figur des Königs Artus in Thomas Tristan', *GRM* 43 (1962), 96-101. Møllk thinks that Thomas wished to remove the courtly world, as it was represented by Arthur in Chrestien's *Erec*, from his own poem, since it no longer existed for him in the sense of an ideal combination of love and chivalry. It seems to me that this courtly world was far removed from the world which Thomas wished to depict in the *Tristan* and he had no desire to transfer its lustre to the world of Mark's court, nor for that matter to the court of Henry II.
46. Frappier, *CCM* 6 (1963), 262 obviously rejects it. Elsewhere confusion reigns. G. Raynaud de Lage in *GRMMA* IV/1 (Heidelberg 1978), p.230 concludes of Thomas that 'on ne le trahit pas cependant en le présentant comme un moraliste plutôt que comme un conteur' and yet believes that he took over the legend 'à la glorification de la fine amor' (p.226).
47. A. Trindade, R.Ph. 32 (1979), 395-6, justly remarks 'In short, it is extremely difficult to envisage the background against which the poem can be placed, and this uncertainty is reflected in the very wide

range of theories as to its date and its relation to the other versions'.

48. E. Türk, Nugae Curialium: Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, Genève 1977. On the relevance of heraldic details in the poem to the court of Henry II, see G. J. Brault, Early Blazon, Oxford 1972, pp.19-21. The evidence is inconclusive.
49. Map also sees in his description of the court a consolation for future generations: 'Cupio etiam ut postera recordetur huius malicie malicia, sciantque tollerabilia perpeti, a nobis intoleranciam passis edocti', De Nugis Curialium, ed. M.R. James, Oxford 1914, dist. IV, c.xiv, p.188.
50. See E.A.R. Brown, 'Eleanor of Aquitaine: Parent, Queen and Duchess', in W. Kibler (ed.), Eleanor of Aquitaine. Patron and Politician, Austin 1977, pp.9-34, esp. p.19. Benton had already exploded the myth of Eleanor's literary court in 'The Court of Champagne as a Literary Center', Speculum 36 (1961), 551-91 and A. Karnein's new portrait of Andreas places him hors du jeu in the present context, see 'Auf der Suche nach einem Autor: Andreas, Verfasser von De Amore', GRM 59 (1978), 1-20. Andreas, it is argued, wrote De amore in Paris, introducing innovations of contemporary vernacular literature to theologically-schooled court officials of Philippe-Auguste. It was probably composed in the 1180s and addressed to a Gautier who was born c.1163, educated with Philippe-Auguste, and whose father was put in charge of the cancellaria by Louis VII. In 1190-1 an Andreas Cambellanus appears in chancery documents and Karnein suggests that our author began his career as a capellanus and rose to cambellanus. The De amore is justly compared with works like the Rota Veneris of Buoncompagno.
51. Op. cit., pp.108-9.
52. E.A.R. Brown, art. cit., 18. Cf. W. L. Warren, Henry II, London 1973, pp.108-36.
53. D. Seward, Eleanor of Aquitaine, London 1978, pp.107 & 128 insists that she was a rival; see, too, R. Pernoud, Eleanor of Aquitaine, transl. P. Wiles, London 1967, pp.140 & 172.

READING MEDIEVAL STUDIES

54. See V.B. Heltzel, Fair Rosamund. A Study of the Development of a Literary Theme, Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities 16, Evanston 1947. There is a short historical account by T.A. Archer, 'Clifford, Rosamund', DNB 9, 75-7.
55. Cf., for example, Sir Thomas Gray of Helon, Scalacronica, ed. J. Stevenson, Edinburgh 1836, p.44.
56. Ed. W. Stubbs, I, London 1879, 242-3.
57. E.A.R. Brown, art. cit., 23.
58. Cf. E.A.R. Brown, art. cit., 19: 'If Andreas's book is rejected as a reliable source of evidence, there is nothing else to support the thesis that Eleanor was occupied with games of amatory debate between 1168 and 1173. Furthermore, there is no indication that at this or any other time she was a leading patron of literature and art, and it seems rather to have been her husband, Henry II, who enjoyed preeminence as a promoter of culture'.